

CI 1343 B lawlor

First name: Ben

Last name: Lawlor

Q1:

The existing classification system for film and TV is clear, it just needs to be expanded to cover other content.

Q2:

The scheme should be consistent, easy to apply for content providers and publishers, practical to administer and allow for transparency and public moderation.

Q3:

No, the current classifications should be consistent across all content.

Q4:

All content should carry some sort of classification, even if it is self assigned, to better inform potential consumers.

Q5:

The current classification for books and film deals with potential impact. Similarly, content targeted at children follows the same standard classification scheme as other content.

Q6:

No.

Q7:

Yes.

Q8:

Yes.

Q9:

No.

Q10:

No.

Q11:

None.

Q12:

There are no truly effective methods, the Internet was designed from the beginning to route around obstructions. Even with an oppressive state and massive resources at its disposal to continually search for and block access to 'subversive' sites, the people of China continue to get around the 'great firewall'. The Australia government and the classification board would do well to avoid putting themselves in a position to be compared with a totalitarian state considering the resources required to try and the inevitable looming failure of any implemented system.

Q13:

Parental supervision.

Q14:

The current system is adequate.

Q15:

Where ever that content is advertised or made available.

Q16:

Q17:

Yes, certainly more practical and arguably more effective.

Q18:

Q19:

Q20:

The current classification system is mostly clear with the exception of MA15 versus M15. Where the understanding suffers is in the inconsistent application of the classifications depending on content.

Q21:

The lack of an R18+ classification for some content (most notably video games) is egregious and deeply embarrassing internationally.

Q22:

Q23:

Yes.

Q24:

None, and to attempt otherwise is pure political theatre and a waste of taxpayer money.

Q25:

No, the current scope is archaic and hopelessly dated with incredibly obtuse inconsistencies.

Q26:

With the availability and dissemination of electronic content, differences in classification are becoming purely academic. The actual consumption of this content is largely immune to the baffling machinations of the Attorneys General, who are increasingly at risk of finding themselves irrelevant. If a tree falls in the woods and no one is around (or more accurately, no one cares to listen), does it make a sound?

Q27:

A scheme administered by the federal government that will update with modern attitudes and not be ham-strung by one tired old man with an agenda.

Q28:

Yes.

Q29:

Nothing else to add other than what has previously been suggested; standardisation of classification across all content.

Other comments: